ORI
29'1
Bow/Much
51004

THE

ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY

Town Hall, Bombay.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018

MUHAMMADANISM IN INDIA.

Cambridge:
PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A.
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

MUHAMMADANISM:

ITS

PRESENT CONDITION AND INFLUENCE

IN INDIA.

BY 51004

HERBERT COURTHOPE BOWEN, B.A.

LATE SCHOLAR AND PRIZEMAN OF CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

"HOMO SUM, NIHIL HUMANUM MIHI ALIENUM PUTO."

Cambridge and London:
MACMILLAN AND CO.
1873.

[*All Rights reserved.*]

This Essay gained the LE BAS PRIZE *for the year* 1872.

MUHAMMADANISM IN INDIA.

BEFORE entering upon the subject proper of our essay, *viz.* the progress and present condition of Muhammadanism in India—the advantages and disadvantages of its moral influence over the minds of the people—its help and hurt in securing peace and prosperity to the nation; it may not be altogether profitless to try and gain some concise, yet distinct idea of what the religion of Muhammad is in its simplest and most fundamental form; that is, of the common foundation on which so many sects have built their Churches; all differing, more or less from one another, according to the natural characteristics and the enlightenment of the different nations which profess their belief.

On examining Muhammadanism, the first thing that strikes us, is its remarkable similarity to the religion of the Jews, especially of the early Jews; and this in two respects. Firstly, in its code of morals; and secondly, in that it naturally divides itself into two *distinct* parts—*Faith*, or the inward and spiritual essence; and *Practice*,

or its outward and visible forms and ceremonies, and that each is *equally* necessary; there being no such thing as justification by faith alone[1]. Let us briefly consider these in order.

The first and principle article of *Faith* is, "There is but one God, and Muhammad is his prophet[2]." It may at first sight appear strange that these two assertions should be made to form *one* article; but on second thoughts it will be seen to be most natural, nay, necessary, that he who preached a *new* religion, and one implacably hostile to that of his nation, should at the very outset proclaim himself, and be believed to be, the inspired agent, or prophet of the God of whom he told, or such religion would at once be set down as the invention of man, and thus have little chance of a hearing, or of a hearty belief. Of this one God, Allah, we are told that he is the only source of being, and that he alone is powerful; that he made us, and that our

[1] "I must, however, make an exception to this in the cases of some of the minor sects of both the Motazalites (separatists) and Sefâtians; for the Jâhedhians belonging to the former, and some of the Morgians belonging to the latter sect, go so far as to assert that *faith* alone, though it were but of the weight of an ant, is sufficient for salvation. See Sale's *Kurân*, *Prel. Discourse*, Sect. 8.—The three chief differences between the religions of the Jew and Arab are these;—the former asserts the infinite supremacy, the latter the sole existence of one God; with the Arab the rewards and punishments of a *future* life are everything, with the Jew these are chiefly of the *present* life, the state of the soul after death being but hinted at; and, last, the Jew rests calmly in his cold conscious superiority, the Arab strains every nerve to convert the world to the one true faith."

[2] See Sale's *Kurân*, ch. 2, pp. 2, 5, also ch. 61, p. 411: also ch. 4 p. 74, and ch. 112, which, in its assertion of the unity of God, is said to be equal in value to one-third part of the whole *Kurân*.

existence depends on his will. And of man's duty towards him, that it is an absolute resignation to his decrees (Islam): however hard we may find it, his will is the best and wisest for us; we *must* take it to be so, for in this world and the next there is no other thing that we can do[1].

This is a wise and noble teaching; not peculiar to Islam, but necessarily forming a part of all religions of the nobler type; yet, alas, from this very resignation is soon evolved a gloomy fatalism, darker and more dread even than that of modern Calvinism, paralyzing with its seeming necessity, silencing with its impossibility of other explanation. Thus it may be stated according to the teaching of the early Musalmán doctors: "Whatever has or shall come to pass in this world, whether it be good, or whether it be bad, proceeds entirely from the Divine Will, and is irrevocably fixed and determined from all eternity in the 'Preserved Table;' God having secretly predetermined not only the adverse and prosperous fortune of every man in the most minute particulars, but also *his faith, or infidelity;* and consequently his everlasting happiness, or misery, after death, which fate or predestination it is not possible by any foresight or wisdom to avoid[2]." The question of the possibility of the co-existence of fate and free-will has been, and ever will be, one of great difficulty to decide; but concerning it we may safely use that formula, so often

[1] Sale's *Kurán*, ch. 2, p. 33.
[2] See Sale's *Prel. Discourse*, p. 79.

made an excuse for cowardice or laziness, if nothing worse, "that it had better be left alone." So Muhammad thought, and touched it in but vaguely in his Kurân, whence it was dug out and formulated only in the beginning of the eighth century, when the Muhammadan world, first becoming acquainted with the literature of other nations, and especially with the works of Aristotle, Euclid, and Ptolemy—men began to crystallize their ideas into dogmas, often, it is to be feared, only with a view to their use as weapons in spiritual warfare. But the prophet, passing this quickly by, turns at once to the duty of man to man; and here he urges action and the doing of good in no ambiguous terms. "Work! work, my brothers! Help, and do not injure one another; and above all things *pray*[1]!" Nor are the fears of Hell and the hopes of Heaven wanting; and men are warned with a terrible earnestness of a *resurrection* and *final day* of *judgment*[2]. With regard to the last he is curiously and incautiously explicit as to how each man must make restitution to those he has injured from his own store of good deeds, receiving in like manner from his injurers; and how for salvation there must be a final remainder of good, &c., &c.[3]; but he insists on one thing worth noticing, that at least for those who have really believed, damnation is not eternal; they will eventually be saved by his intercession. We could smile at this idea that God requires to be entreated to save

[1] See *Kurân*, ch. 2, 20, 29, &c., &c.

[2] See *Kurân*, ch. 17, 84, and 85.

[3] See *Kurân*, ch. 23, 7, &c., also Sale's *Prel. Discourse*, Sect. 4.

any man—this "influence at Court" that Muhammad promises to exert in man's behalf—did we not remember that a doctrine very similar to this is still prevalent at the present day. "Is God a man that he should be entreated[1]?"

Let us now pass to Musalmán principles of *Practice.*

The first and most imperative duty of the true believer is *prayer:* prayer fervent and frequent: five times a day with his face towards Mecca he must bow down to Allah, crying "Allah ackbar," God is good[2]. At morn, at noon, afternoon, evening, night—no excuse—time, place, business, pleasure, are nought in comparison with God's unalterable command[3]—*pray!* It must be good, it would seem, this continual compelling of men to place things to come above things present; to interrupt any business, any pleasure, at any time, in any place, for a few minutes' prayer, when the bell calls, and the crier cries from the mosque. But we manage things better, and are careful not to let our prayers interfere with our pursuits.

What the words used should be, custom and the Imams (elders) generally prescribe; as, however, there is no priestly authority in Islam, each is free to a great

[1] Christ's intercession, He Himself being part of the Godhead, but represents the internal pleading of mercy with justice, which even man can experience in himself.

[2] See *Kurán*, ch. 30.

[3] It is strongly suggestive that Allah's first command was for fifty times, but that on Moses suggesting that the burden would be intolerable, Allah at last reduced it to five.

extent to express his own longings in his own words; at least we know there are no tedious liturgies to take the edge off his zeal. The keystone of religion is prayer, and the keystone of prayer *cleanliness*[1]; the frequent washing, therefore, of all parts of the body is emphatically enjoined by the Kurân: a very necessary injunction in all hot climates, especially in India, where the natives have a natural proneness for dirt; as may be seen at Benares, or any other essentially Hindu town.

"Prayer," we are told, "will carry a man half way to God, but fasting will bring him to the door of heaven, and alms gain him entrance[2]." So it was, that while the retired and self-saving life of a hermit, and the self-inflicted pains of an ascetic were evidently alike odious to the vigorous mind of Muhammad[3]; he nevertheless, instituted in each year a fast of thirty days, during which all true Musalmáns must abstain from eating and drinking, and women, and baths, and perfumes, at least from sunrise to sunset: and he, moreover, recommended abstinence at all times, setting forth as the advantages to be derived therefrom, the healthful tone of mind to be obtained from the practice of self-

[1] *Kurân*, ch. 3, 4, 5.

[2] See Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, ch. 50, or the works of Maracci, Reland, and Chardin, which he quotes. Compare *Rig. Veda*, 1. 125, 56. "He who gives alms goes to the highest place in heaven." Or, again, "The kind mortal is greater than the great in heaven." Also the similar statements so often made to Jews and Christians.

[3] D'Herbelot tells us that the swarms of Dervishes, Fakirs, &c., which subsequently inundated Arabia, did not begin to appear till the year 300 of the Hegira, *i. e.* I, suppose, during the reign of Samanide Nasser (A.D. 914—943).

restraint, and the better subduing of the flesh to the spirit[1]. On placing this side by side with the large license in general permitted, we can easily see that the moral meant to be drawn is, that the mere enjoyment of pleasures is not in itself hurtful, but only the so far allowing them to gain a hold upon us that they cannot be thrown aside at will. The use of wine and all strong drink is likewise strictly prohibited—a most salutary measure, and almost a necessary one, in the tropics[2].

Lastly, as a duty necessary for salvation, the Kurân commands the giving of alms; the smallest fraction a man can rightly give is one-tenth of his annual income[3], or, if his conscience accuses him of any fraud in aught, as much as one-fifth is required. Thus is charity deprived of all vainglorious merit for the giver, and the receipt of charity of all demoralizing sense of indignity for the honest poor man (who can receive it as his *right*, and not as an ungracious gift), and a general benevolence taught in such sort, that no one shall think it nobler, or less necessary, to help a needy stranger than a poor relation. Nor does this large charity stop at mankind; it is extended to all living things, in whose future existence men are taught to believe[4]. The old age of all beasts of burden and domestic

[1] *Kurân*, ch. 2.

[2] See *Kurân*, ch. 2. My own experience goes to shew me that *many* more European constitutions are annually ruined by mere drink, than by the direct influence of the climate in either Indies.

[3] *Kurân*, ch. 2, 57 and 58. This "legal alms" is now reduced in India to about 2½ per cent. roughly.

[4] See *Kurân*, ch. 6, p. 95.

animals is to be made at least tolerable to them; while any cruelty to them at any time is pronounced to be a direct sin against their Creator.

A pilgrimage to the holy city of Mecca, at least once during life, was likewise urgently enjoined by the Prophet; an observance still held to be of wonderfully purifying power, and by some even to be necessary to salvation[1]. This, of course, has its parallels in the Jewish festivals at Jerusalem, and, during the middle ages, in the journeys to Rome and the Holy Sepulchre.

Before we pass to India, a word or two on the general morality of Muhammadanism. It is a favourite and frequent charge against this religion that it is sensual, and that its heaven and hell are sensual. Now, we find that all those who have examined the matter carefully, agree in asserting at least this, that all the internal forces of Islam tend towards continence and purity (Hallam goes so far as to assert that it is not sensual[2]); but that at the time of its first propagation the external forces of impurity and lust were so powerful, that all that could be at first effected was a compromise; though no doubt was allowed as to which were the better. Muhammad did not "pander to the vices of his countrymen;" and he must be an atheist who would solemnly urge such as the chief cause of the success of a religion which for more than twelve centuries has been

[1] *Kurân*, ch. 2, p. 21, ch. 3, and 22.

[2] I have since read the *Kurân* carefully, and most fully do I endorse this opinion.

the stay and life-star of one-fifth of all God-created men; but he was wise enough to see that, as things were, any violent measures in this direction would have ruined all the good he hoped to do, and did, in others; and so was fain to content himself with setting certain fixed bounds to vice, beyond which it must not go. We have already noticed the fast instituted during the month Ramadan, and the forbidding of all strong drink; but still further, we find a high premium set on a life of continued self-negation, the reward being the highest heaven hereafter—the very seventh heaven itself. Nor, lastly, would it, in our opinion, be less fair to make a general charge of sensuality against Judaism, because Israel's kings and princes were allowed to indulge in a plurality of wives and concubines. Solomon's wives were seven hundred, and his concubines three hundred; Muhammad limits the number to four; a luxury only possible to the rich[1]. As to the sensuality of the future life—of its joys and pains—holding and proclaiming, as the Prophet did, the doctrine of a bodily resurrection (which, as we all know, originated with the Egyptians), he very naturally restored it to the full possession and exercise of its best powers, and that union of sensual and intellectual enjoyment, "which are necessary for the complete happiness of the double creature, the perfect man." But the indulgence of luxury, and the unbounded license of appetite, he takes care to state will not constitute all man's future joy; all

[1] *Kurân*, ch. 4, p. 35.

such trivial pleasures will be forgotten by those who have once gazed on the face of God. "My brothers," he cries, "ye shall sit on thrones facing each other; and your hearts shall be filled with compassion; and no one shall think there is not room for his brother." It is true his descriptions have been twisted by the licentious to mean an eternal triumph of lust and passion, but we believe we are right in affirming that no educated Musalmán, in India at least, now believes in such grossness[1].

Again, it is charged against Islam that it is preached by the sword. Alas, there is no doubt that the plain teaching of the Kuràn is that the followers of Islam are to reduce the whole world to obedience, giving to every nation the alternative of conversion, a submission amounting to slavery, or death[2]. Without quoting Charlemagne's conversion of the Saxons, the Spaniards of the Indians, the Inquisition, &c., &c., we must say at once, that, though in practice it may be no worse than many other religions, yet, because Islam upholds wholesale murder in theory as justifiable, we utterly abominate it, and think no words too strong to express our horror on this point. Yet, in common justice, we must remember that the Kuràn was written to meet the wants, local and temporary, of a struggling Arabian tribe, and not to

[1] For many years I have lived among hundreds of Indian Musalmáns of the lower classes, and have *never* seen or heard of anything particularly sensual about them; moreover, I have remarked that they were all, and always, peculiarly abstemious in their meat, and clean in their habits.

[2] *Kuràn*, ch. 2, 3, 8, 47, &c.

suit a modern nation; and, as when the Church was wrestling in pain with the terrible giant of Infidelity, murder and torture seemed lawful to the mediæval mind, so may the sword have seemed right to the Prophet while his blood was hot. We shall find, moreover, that the fierce fanaticism of the Kuràn has been much smoothed down by successive generations of Scholiasts and interpreters, and a not unsymmetrical polity evolved from its once wild, one-sided bigotry; and, further, that of late, in India, whole sects, as, the Shias and Sunis, have been bold enough to declare that they consider Holy War (Jihad) in no way binding on them, while even the Muftis of Mecca have refrained from saying that is so.

For the rest, the morality of Islam is that of our "Ten Commandments," with the exception of the fourth, and an absurdly literal interpretation of the second. Friday is the day set apart for special prayer, but nothing is considered wrong on it which would not be wrong on any other day[1]. In the case of the second, the command is carried so far, that all pictures and statues of any sort, for any purpose, are pronounced to be unlawful[2]; the consequence of which has been that, though possessing numberless eminent men in literature and science, Muhammadans are to the present day entirely destitute of all art and men of art, except

[1] *Kuràn*, ch. 62.

[2] Even in the solitary instance of the carved animals in the "lion-fountain," in one of the courts of the Alhambra, the lions seem purposely made utterly unlike nature.

architecture and architects. Lastly, Musalmàns are taught to love and fear God, and to love their neighbours (if Musalmàns); and though the sublime doctrine of utter forgiveness is not preached, revenge is at least moderated, and is to be obtained by means of the law whenever possible[1]. The traditions of the Jews and the inspiration of their prophets are likewise accepted and believed in, as are also the mission and inspiration of Christ, to whom, however, Godhead is denied; and it has been even attempted to prove that Muhammad was the "Paraclete," or Spirit promised by Christ to mankind[2].

Having thus explained the groundwork of Muhammadanism, that is the beliefs held in common by all its different sects, we shall now pass to the consideration of its present condition in India.

It was in the year 1001, that Mahmud I., the founder of the empire of Ghazna, having seized and occupied Kabul and Peshawar; advanced thence across the Indus, conquered the Panjàb, and the peninsula of Gujerat, and penetrated even as far as the Ganges[3]. Through him

[1] Mr. W. Hunter tells us that quite one-half of the work of the 'cutcheries' or Indian district courts, consists in settling the petty disputes of the natives, for by this means are Musalmáns accustomed to pay off their grudges on their neighbours.

[2] *Kurán*, ch. 61. In the 61st chapter of the *Kurán* Christ is made to prophesy "an apostle shall come after me whose name shall be Ahmad (the Illustrious)," one of Muhammad's names; the Persian paraphrast quotes in support of this John xvi. 7, &c. "I go to my Father, and the Paraclete shall come unto you;" but he spells the word "Periclyte," which means Illustrious, and all the doctors of Islam follow his example.

[3] The Musalmàn invasions, however, practically date from the 8th century, when the Arabs temporarily conquered Sindh.

Muhammadanism was first really spread in India, and the commercial intercourse between it and the West restored, which once more raised Bactria to a high state of prosperity—Bactria, that famous home, and centre of radiation of the great Aryan family. Mahmud himself, belonged to the Persian sect of Muhammadans called Shias or Schismatics, but after his reign the Ghaznavide empire falling rapidly into decay, became the prey of the Seljuks, a Turkish race, who had embraced the Suni, or orthodox doctrines, about the year 970. From that time the Shias have never had any real power in India, and have even suffered many a merciless persecution there at the hands of their more numerous and bitter enemies, the Sunis. All the Emperors of Mughul were, we believe, without exception Sunis; and even the magnanimous Ackbar, large-minded and humane as he showed himself to be towards his Hindu subjects, could never entirely rise superior to his inborn hatred for the then only rival sect of Islam. It is a fact well worthy of notice, that the sovereign power in India on our arrival there, was Suni, for, with the single exception of the Sepoys, the only men who have disturbed the internal peace of our Eastern Empire have been men belonging to a sect of the Sunis, helped and more or less protected, though never ardently loved, by them. Even in the case of that Mutiny, Kaye tells us that "undoubtedly the prime movers in rebellion, and those who most zealously fanned its sparks into flames, were Musalmáns," and these Musalmáns, Wahàbis. But of this hereafter.

To understand properly the animosity between Shiah and Suni, we must go back as far as the year 644 A. D., to the reign of Othman, the third successor of the great Prophet. Abu Beker, Muhammad's immediate successor, had been the first to collect the disconnected parts of the Kurán from the mutton-bones and palm-leaves on which its chapters were originally written, and to publish them as a complete whole. But, during the reign of Omar, and the early part of that of Othman, chiefly owing to the manifest confusion in the arrangement of the first, several different versions of the Holy Book had appeared; insomuch that the Caliph very wisely determined to settle the text once for all; and having with much care and labour prepared a standard edition, ordered all the others to be burnt.

Now, the Persians had never recognised the authority of these first three Caliphs, though they had been forced to obey them. Abu Beker had beaten them; Omar had conquered and converted them; and the haughty Othman now claimed absolute authority in all doctrinal matters. This they were determined not to endure: so, on a party in the state rising in support of the claims of Ali, Muhammad's son-in-law, the Persians joined them to a man, and thus ensured their speedy success. Omar had fallen by the hand of a Persian peasant; and it is more than probable that the new sect were concerned in Othman's violent end.

The Shias, or "Schismatics," as the "Orthodox"

Sunis then styled them, next refused to recognize the new Kurân; asserting, not without some truth, that the original text of Abu Beker had been tampered with by the partisans of Othman, and several passages erased to which hitherto appeals had been made by those who refused unconditional obedience to the Caliph; and further maintained that Ali was the first legal successor of the Prophet, and that he was the "Vicar of God."

The root of the difference, then, between the two sects lies in this matter of the Caliphs or Imams, the text of the Kurân, and the refusal of the Sunis to exalt Ali above his predecessors. The Shias believe in twelve Imams, an inspired Apostolic descent from the Prophet of God, viz. Ali, Hassan, and Hosein, and the descendants of Hosein to the ninth generation; the Sunis only in six of the twelve, beginning at Abu Beker, as having as yet appeared. The last Imam, Mahdi (a guide), disappeared so mysteriously from earth, that to this day his end is uncertain, and the Shias believe him to be hidden away from sinful mortals somewhere beyond the north-western frontier. The Shias especially reverence Ali's sons, Hassan and Hosein, in honour of whom are their greatest festivals, and to celebrate the events in whose lives they have even passion-plays in Persia. The Sunis only recognize them as holy men; and further charge their rivals with the murder of Omar and Othman. Both sects, however, hold in common the fundamental doctrines of the faith, which I began by endeavouring to explain; though the "orthodox" have

built thereon a far more elaborate ceremonial. The "Schismatics" have always been a persecuted sect in every part of the world, except Persia; hunted and hounded down as lately in Syria, and from time to time in India, they have invented what may be termed "a doctrine of compromise" (Takiyah), that is, a system of evasion, by means of which they may save their bodies, though somewhat at their souls' expense. When put to great peril by their persecutors, they may abjure their most distinctive and cherished doctrines, and even, in their extremity, curse the twelve Imams. Since, however, India has become a part of our empire all persecution of a violent nature has been prevented, and all temptation, therefore, to such falseness has been removed. Let us hope that so ignominious a doctrine may cease with the cessation of the primal cause. As we read in the Hindu's *Book of the Future* of a time when there shall be one caste and one religion, and as in fact all religions of any real nobleness hold, so do we find that Muhammadans believe in the eventual triumph of what is to them the only true Faith. With the Shias it is to be when Mahdi shall appear. Till then, the world shall suffer much pain and be troubled, and the Faithful endure much tribulation at the hands of heretical Sunis, Christians, and others. But when he comes, all wrongs will be righted, and the whole world converted to the true knowledge of God; the two great religions shall be made one, and Christians become Shias. "It is distinctly laid down in our Muhammadan law," says a

pamphlet[1] of this sect, "that at the time when the above-named Imam shall appear, Jesus Christ (may safety attend him!) shall descend from the Fourth Heaven, and friendship, not enmity, shall exist between these two great ones." With the Sunis, it is to be a general conquest, when Mahdi shall lead them to victory over the hated Giaour, and the world upon its knees shall accept the salvation of the faith of Islam.

To enter further into the minutiæ of the differences between these two sects would only be tedious, and enough has been already said to shew what is likely to be, and what is the present state of feeling between them[2]. I hasten, therefore, to a consideration of those causes which led to so marvellous a revival, so vigorous a stirring up of the souls and consciences of men to a newer and holier life, that its effect has been felt throughout the length and breadth of Islam—one so full of truth, that even those who stood most fiercely against it have been forced, despite themselves, to acknowledge its worth and meaning by the reforms which they themselves have been driven to adopt. I shall, of course, in what I have got to say, restrict myself more particularly to the religious life of our Empire.

I commenced by shewing that the pith and real

[1] "On the word Jihad, as it is understood and believed by the Shiah Sect," by Munshi Amir Ali Khan Bahadur, Calcutta, 1871. The same learned scholar has also published a very able answer to Mr W. Hunter's "Indian Musalmáns."

[2] I have, in the text, only dwelt upon the differences of *three* sects; they number altogether nearly 100; and it is moreover a boast of the Musalmàns that in the variety of their sects they excel all other religions.

essence of Muhammadanism consisted, firstly, in the assertion that "there is but one God;" that is, in the negation of polytheism; the moral benefit of which is obvious, for with a plurality of Gods, when any one God may be thought to disapprove of certain conduct, another may generally be found who will approve, or at least permit, the same; whereby great laxity and hurtful unstableness of conscience are wont to arise. And, secondly, that it consisted in a practical reform, and a practical introduction of morality into every-day public and private life. Muhammad laid no claims to miracles or to divinity; he simply spoke from his heart the truth which was in it, in those strong burning words of inspiration in which all great truths are wont to clothe themselves; and because in these there were thoughts and longings which for years had lain smoking and smouldering, known or unknown, in the hearts of countless men; therefore was his preaching listened to; therefore did men cleave to him, and believe him. This practical morality, this regenerating of society has been the main stand-point, if not the only one, of all preachers of all new religions—or rather of *renewed* religions, for search back as far as we will, we can never find the absolutely *first* form of any, this being lost in the dim mists that shroud the earliest manifestations of the Deity, or in the Deity himself: the elaborating of dogmas and the evolution of semi-metaphysical doctrines have been left to their followers of a generation or two later. Alas, it is a manifest law, and one as visible in

the Christianity of to-day as in any other, that with this elaboration and this evolution all religions tend rapidly to degenerate. As theology grows, morality of practice and singleness of heart decay. Nor has the faith of Islam been any exception to this rule. As early as the eighth century we find Muhammadanism coming in contact with the literature of the outer world, and under the influence of such works as Aristotle's, or, which is more to our present purpose, of the works of the Indian philosopher Ahmad ben Yahia (A.D. 900), inventing a system of theology to meet the wants, to which the study of philosophy and science naturally gave rise. We, of Europe, owe much to the Muhammadans of this time. While we were still grossly dark and ignorant, they were cultivating chemistry, studying mathematics, astronomy, and especially geography; and medicine was being brought to such a perfection by Avicenna, that for centuries after he held undisputed sway in that science. Nor was this all; through Roschd[1], an Arabian scholar, we were for the first time to become acquainted with Aristotle, whose philosophy, besides other things, was destined to play so prominent a part in the Christianity of the middle ages. Now, in the introduction of all this new thought, and these new ways of thinking, there was undoubtedly a large, an incalculable amount of good: it established, at least to a certain extent, a

[1] He lived during the twelfth century and is more commonly known by the name of Averroes. D'Herbelot tells us that for long we had no other text of Aristotle but a Latin translation of his (Roschd's) version, of which Thomas Aquinas made great use.

larger-mindedness, and some sort of a religious toleration (a virtue in which Islam has ever been deficient): yet I think we must look to this period, if to any, for the first minute germs of that bindweed growth, which afterwards had well-nigh destroyed the vigorous first life of Islam; for it has been well said that as soon as men can bear to theorize on any matter, that matter has ceased to be to them one of vital and innermost-heart importance. The germ, I say, is to be found here; but to see what manner of plant grew therefrom we must turn to India and examine the ground in which it had to grow. Muhammadanism was first introduced into India at the beginning of the eleventh century, that is, just when Bráhmanism, having thoroughly driven out the sect of Buddha, had re-established itself in its tyranny over all social and religious life. Now, the two external characteristics of Bráhmanism are the absolute despotism of its priests, and its iron-jointed system of castes. With these, then, the faith of Islam being brought into contact, by each, in a manner, was greatly modified. But before we consider this, there is another point which particularly requires notice.

The Indian mind, so scholars tell us, is essentially prone to speculation: from the very first it has been given up, more than any other in the world, to a barren philosophizing on matters which men can never know. Its literature in this respect is enormous, for over this, strange to say, the Bráhmans seem never to have had any great power; but in all his investigations, and glori-

ous flights of fancy, the Hindu has ever restricted himself to the problems of what was the initial, and is to be the final, state of the soul, and seemingly has never thought it worth his while to enquire into the wherefore of its present condition. He was willing to accept the view that at best this life is but pain and sorrow, and resigning himself to it without a murmur, looked out with eyes of deep solitary meaning ever towards the unknown future[1]. We see, therefore, into what a hot-bed the germ was transplanted: that it grew and flourished we need only use our eyes to see. It was not long before the Indian Musalmáns had adopted the system of castes, and had hereby given the death-blow to that great doctrine of the Prophet's, "the equality of man." And as time went on the contact with the arrogant Priesthood, too, produced its effect. The Kazis, who, corresponding to the Jewish scribes, had originally been merely the administrators of the domestic law, began to claim for themselves the attributes of Priests, and to strive to change their authority from a social to a religious one. The Mòsques becoming ashamed of their plain and modest appearance began to deck themselves in the finery of heathen temples; and their services seeming now too simple, a more gorgeous ritual was adopted; while their modest feasts swelled to intemperate and costly pageants[2]. On flowed the tide of progress. But from what to what? Not

[1] To this feeling I think we may not too rashly attribute, in a great measure, the spread of the faith of "resignation" in India.

[2] See *Kuràn*, ch. 7, pp. 110, &c., on the sin of arrogance and display.

from a narrower to a larger faith, but from simplicity and truth to elaborate emptiness! After a time the Holy Book itself was found to be deficient, or too little expanded for general use; and such works as the Hidaya, the Suni Kuràn, and others were written to supply its defects, and to be consulted in its stead; or, as was the case with the Veda of the Brâhmans, the mere words were considered divine, while their original meaning was lost. The bindweed theology put forth its leaves and budded, and burst into full flower! No longer were men to obtain the salvation of their souls simply and solely by the purity of their lives, and the rectitude of their personal conduct; it was necessary that they should hold such and such doctrines; nay, morality was of little consequence compared with what a man professed his views to be on this or that subject. Endless were the bowings and genuflexions requisite in the mosques; profuse the adornment of tombs; lavish the expenditure on the anniversaries of the dead, and the street processions; and terrible the immorality of men on all sides. No longer was drunkenness unknown; no longer had fornication and adultery to crouch in dark corners; they revelled in the high places of the land; nay, the very bands of pilgrims wallowed in filth and iniquity! Yet, be a man never so reprobate, this pilgrimage to the Prophet's tomb would make him pure,—if so be he paid the proper fees thereat. He, who alive had denied his power to work miracles[1], dead and dusty in

[1] *Kuràn*, ch. 13.

his tomb, now worked the greatest—and for fees! Yea, verily, that which had begun with simplicity and earnest protest against idolatry, was now become an elaborate vanity, a hideous lie! The worship of the one God was now the worship of empty shows, a manifest idolatry before the face of all men!

I write not of the work of a day or of a year, but of eight centuries,—of a growth of evil as slow and imperceptible as the growth of an oak.

Matters had now become so utterly desperate for many men, that there was hope; for, as Carlyle says, "despair at its worst is after all but a mad kind of hope." And, as has always happened in the world with religions that hold aught at all of truth, when clouds and thick darkness have come down, and in the terrible silence and suspense all things seem lost, and men's hearts are failing them for fear, some one man has been found, who, with bold, Luther-like voice, will dare to stand forth and speak strong, true words, which have been stirring so long in all true men's hearts, though but dimly and unutterably; so now, in its distress, did one man step forward to bear witness to the truth which was in Islam. This man was Sayyid Ahmad.

Sayyid Ahmad, a native of the British district of Rai Bareli, was born in the sacred month, Muharram, 1786 A.D. He commenced his career as a soldier in the cavalry of that celebrated freebooter, Amir Khan Pindari (afterwards Nawab of Tonk), who for many years ravaged the rich opium district of Malwa with

impunity; but, finding after a while (about the year 1816) that robbery was becoming both dangerous and unprofitable, Ahmad gave it up and went to study the Sacred Law at Delhi. In three years he came forth as a preacher, vigorously and fearlessly attacked the abuses which had crept into Indian Muhammadanism, and by this means soon gathered round him a turbulent and fanatic following. Commencing among the Rohillas, he gradually worked his way down the Ganges to Calcutta, making converts, and appointing agents in all the principal towns on his route. At Patna, where he made a rather longer stay than at other places, his disciples swelled to such a crowd, that he was forced to form a regular system of government, with Patna as a permanent centre. He, moreover, appointed by a formal deed, such as Musalmàn Emperors were wont to use in nominating governors of provinces, four Caliphs or spiritual vicegerents, and a High-priest. At this period of his life, appalled and horror-stricken at the drunkenness and fornication in which the people wallowed, his preaching was entirely that of a practical morality, a religion of every-day life. He re-asserted the unity of God and the equality of man, and insisted that God should be worshipped without mediation of any kind. "The law of the Prophet is founded on two things: *first*, the not attributing to any creature the attribute of God (Shirk); and, *second*, not inventing forms and practices (Bid'at) which were not invented in the days of the Prophet, and his successors, the Caliphs. The former consists in

disbelieving in the efficacy of the mediation of angels, spirits, prophets, or saints; in considering them as helpless as oneself in respect to the power of God; in never making any offering to them, or believing that in any way they can influence the accidents of life. The latter, in adhering to all practices and devotions observed in the time of the Prophet; in avoiding all such innovations as elaborate marriage ceremonies, the adorning of tombs, anniversaries of the dead, street processions, and the like[1]." But slowly, and as success grew more certain, and as men turned to him to give them something to hold by in place of what he had destroyed, Ahmad's views began to form themselves into doctrines and dogmas, which, after his visit to Mecca in 1822, and his conversion there by the sect of Abdal Waháb, became what is now called "Indian Wahábi-ism." This sect had been originated in Arabia in the year 1723, by a young Neid chief, called Abdal Waháb (the servant of him who gives everything), under circumstances very similar to those which I have just described in India. Though the temporal successes of this reformation had entirely disappeared in 1813, their magnitude may be imagined when we find that by 1810 it had conquered the most fertile provinces of Asiatic Turkey, all Syria, had swooped down on Mecca and Medina with over 100,000 men, plundered and defiled the sacred mosque and the Prophet's tomb; had sustained a war with the

[1] Condensed from *Calcutta Review*, No. c. Such statements only too clearly shew the degradation into which Islam had fallen.

British in the Persian Gulf; and even threatened Constantinople itself. We have, however, here rather to do with its doctrines than its conquests. These are accordingly as follows:—The faith of Islam, being reduced to a pure theism, there are required—"*First*, an absolute reliance on one God; *second*, absolute renunciation of any mediator between man and his Maker, including the rejection of the prayers of the saints, and even of the semi-divine mediation of Muhammad himself; *third*, the right of private interpretation, and the rejection of all priestly glosses on the scriptures; *fourth*, absolute rejection of all forms and observances of mediæval and modern growth; *fifth*, constant looking for the Imam who will lead the true believers to victory over the Infidels; *sixth*, constant recognition, both in theory and practice, of the duty of waging war against all Infidels; *seventh*, implicit obedience to the spiritual guide[1]." Such were the views which Ahmad now adopted and preached, when, landing at Bombay in 1822, and burning with indignation at his expulsion from Mecca (on account of his sect), he fiercely determined to found such a power in India, as his master had founded in Arabia a few years before.

We can clearly see how all this of Ahmad went to the root of the matter. No more theology! no more fantastic ritual! no more priest-worship! Away with

[1] See Mr W. Hunter's "*Our Indian Musalmàns*."

them! There is but one God and one Book of God! There is but one way to be saved—the denial of self! No wonder that men pressed and thronged around him by thousands, and fought and jostled each other to touch even the hem of his garment! Here was the very man they had been waiting for, for so long years, to say for them what they could not say! Nay, here was Mahdi himself, the long-looked-for, cried some. With teeth set firm in the old Puritan way, with unflinching courage and dogged determination to destroy, he and a small band of disciples preached up through the crowded districts with ever-increasing success, on to the Peshawar frontier, where, in 1824, we find them proclaiming a Jihad, or crescentade, against the Sikhs of the Panjàb. Natural, this fierce turning on the Infidel, this wild idea of purging India from end to end of all that was not Islam—natural, yet in the end fatal, as all blood-shedding has eventually proved in all causes, and most in that of religion—(as witness Roman Catholicism). But here, or soon after this period, the religious movement separates itself from the person of the reformer, so we too must leave him. Suffice it to say that at length, grasping too violently at temporal power, he perished miserably by the hand of a common soldier: yet that, before his death in 1831, he had established at Sittana a rebel camp of refuge, which was destined to be, and is still, a very thorn in our side, on the North-Western frontier, and which has cost us at least three bloody campaigns (one even as late as 1868), by which

we have with much trouble in a great measure crushed the rising power[1].

During Ahmad's lifetime, as I have mentioned, his followers had proclaimed him to be the long-looked-for Mahdi; so now at his death, to support the truth of their assertion, they were forced to overturn the accepted belief that Mahdi's advent was immediately to precede the final millennium, and to prove that it more properly came halfway between that period and Muhammad's death. Having established this to their own satisfaction, despite even the difficulty that in the Kurân Mahdi always means God, they next turned their attention to the consideration of Holy War.

And now sprung up a copious literature on the subject. Of prime importance and inevitable was the duty of rebellion against the Infidel; great and manifold the benefits to be derived therefrom—rain in due season, increase of flocks and herds, justice and religious vitality—songs were sung of it along the roads; rebels drilled on the frontier to their music; tracts were sold openly in the streets; treatises of more flagrant sedition passed from hand to hand, were eagerly read in private, and passed on. This was indeed a time of great danger for us in India; the aroused vigour and excited consciousness of the nation seemed to be rising with full force against us, the chief infidel (*i.e.* non-Muhammadan)

[1] For a full account of the formation of the rebel camp at Sittana, and of the wars it has cost us, see *Calcutta Review*, Nos. C., CI., CII., or Mr W. Hunter's most interesting book already quoted. The present commander of the camp is, I believe, one Fyaz Ali.

power in the Empire, and to be on the point of plunging us into a general religious war; so eager are men ever to lay the blame of their own sins upon others. Here is one of their favourite songs, the "Risala Jihad:"—

"First, I glorify God who is beyond all praise; I laud his Prophet and write a song on Holy War;
Holy War is war carried on for religion, without any lust of power, in the sacred Scriptures its glories are related. I mention a few—
War against the Infidel is incumbent on all Musalmâns; make provision for it before all things."

Again:

"He who shall equip a warrior in the cause of God shall obtain a martyr's reward;
His children dread not the trouble of the grave; nor the last trump; nor the Day of Judgment.
Cease to be cowards; join the divine leader and smite the Infidel."

And again:—

"How long will you be able to remain with your wives and children? How long to escape death?
If you give up this world for the sake of God you enjoy the pleasures of Heaven for ever.
Fill the uttermost parts of India with Islam, so that no sound may be heard but 'Allah! Allah!'"[1]

And, verily, the men were in earnest who wrote this, and others like this. How grandly they sound even in translation! Like one of Walt Whitman's great stirring songs, with the rush and ring of battle in them! "Fill the uttermost parts of India with 'Allah! Allah!'"

The Patna Caliphs were working wonders—men of indomitable strength of will, blameless in their personal

[1] *Calcutta Review*, No. CII.

lives, careless of danger, they were organizing, raising and supplying money, enlisting recruits, and sending forth missionaries to all parts of India. At first they strove only to rouse men's consciences, but after a while, to keep the movement alive and afoot, they were driven to have recourse to the old fanatic feud between Musalmàns and Christians. "India," they asserted, "was Darul-harb, a country of the Infidel; and he who would save his soul must fight or fly." So matters went on, culminating to a crisis. Yet it must not be supposed that such a state of affairs was escaping the notice of British authority. In 1847, Sir H. Lawrence officially declared that men connected with the Patna Propaganda were well known to be fighters for religion in the Panjàb; in 1852 they were convicted of treasonable correspondence with our troops. I have no space, nor adequate means, for going into details of the frontier war of 1858, nor of the various other expeditions we were forced to send to the North-West, even up to the year 1868 (between 1850 and 1863, I believe they were some nineteen or twenty in number), but the mere fact of their having taken place will sufficiently shew that we were on the alert. It, however, remained for the State Trials of 1864-5 to bring clearly and prominently before the public the marvellous network of conspiracy, spread over the length and breadth of India, by means of which the Patna Caliphs had for so long been able, under our very noses, to supply the rebels with all the sinews and appurtenances of war.

It now appears that wherever the sect had mustered in sufficiently large numbers, there a district centre had been established, over which was placed a staunch and well-trained disciple; and such was the acuteness and judgment with which they were chosen, that, Mr Hunter tells us, during so many years of danger and excitement not one man turned traitor. Every centre was modelled on the plan of the one at Patna, and was subordinate to it; at the same time having the power to collect men and money as best it could. These, both men and money, were immediately sent up to head-quarters; and thence again gradually filtered through the different centres on to the frontier of the Panjàb. The men were obtained by working on the consciences of young and hot-headed enthusiasts, and by holding out false hopes (how false more than one dupe has himself testified); money, by the appropriation of the "legal alms" before mentioned (about $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.), and when this was found insufficient, of the "voluntary alms" properly meant for the poor, and generally collected on the eves of the great festivals. The means by which both men and money were forwarded through a length of nearly two thousand miles of country on to the camp, the cant words invented for the one, the aliases for the other,—are in themselves masterpieces of cunning and cleverness. We must, however, remember that in more than one case (as for instance in that of Shafi, the meat-supplier to the British forces), the most influential and hard-working of the rebels were in the employ of Government, and so could

manage their remittances with very little danger of attracting notice.

For the last seven years, State Trials have been going on in India, and rebel after rebel has been condemned, many a district-centre broken up, and a system of supervision and personal restraint over the suspected established, by means of which traitors and treason have been to a great extent held in check, if nothing more. Still, the matter is a very delicate one; and, while crushing sedition, Government has had to keep in mind that a large number of the disaffected have acted, and still act, solely in accordance with the dictates of their consciences. Notably had so acted the high-priest of Patna, Yahiya Ali, and Jaffir, the scrivener, who were arraigned at the Amballa Trial of 1864; so that while administering justice it has had to remember mercy; and, above all, it has been obliged to be very careful not to give a rebel a chance of becoming a martyr by too vindictive a punishment. In most cases, I believe, for this reason capital sentences have been commuted into transportations for life; and, in some, even these again have been changed into exile for a certain period of years.

But we must not suppose, on the other hand, that the Wahábis have been allowed to spread their sedition unopposed by their own countrymen. Far from it; besides the inborn hatred between sect and sect (surely Christian in this), the revolutionary and anabaptist teaching of the reformers has made them a terror to all men of property and of any real stake in the country.

Even in 1830, it would have been death to a Wahábi to be seen in Mecca—Mecca, the Rome of the Suni sect. But for all that, the Wahábi takes his stand on very strong ground; he does not always preach sedition: the sturdy morality, and the negation of self, which he proclaims, together with the great doctrine of the equality of all men before God; his championship of free thought; and, above all, the noble example he so often gives in his own life, of what he urges on others, cannot fail to attract and hold the hearts and minds of many. Moreover, his is plainly the only legitimate interpretation of the Kuràn, as far as it relates to Holy War (Jihad); and not only of this, but of the Hidaya itself, the great Indian text-book; so that there was no escape from his importunities, even for those who were large-minded enough to confess that the social law of the Kuràn was framed for very different days. When we consider, still further, the disjointed state of the times, the great want there was of earnestness, simplicity, and vigour, we shall not, I think, find it hard to understand how it was that so many of different opinions should have allowed themselves to be led, first into supporting so puritanical a form of Islam, and then into plotting against its hereditary enemies, especially as for some time they ran very small risk in so doing. But as soon as it became a matter of real danger to be found connected in any way with the rebels, men began to look around them for a means of escaping from these uncomfortable conscience-stirrers; something to hold up and say, "We

stand by this;" and as the majority of the clergy (*i.e.* those who, as preachers, mosque-keepers, criers, &c. live by religion—every head of a family is its high-priest), being either landholders, or living by land set apart for pious uses, were naturally on the side of order, the result has been that the doctors of the two great sects of India have come forward with "Fatwas," or legal decisions on this subject of Holy War; and we must rejoice to know that these are entirely on the side of peace and loyalty. The Shias proclaim that "Jihad" is unlawful unless seven different things happen, of which the chief are—"that the rightful Imam be present, and grant permission; that the war be against mutineers (*i.e.*, not settled authorities), and the enemies of God; and that the nation be really ready[1]." The Sunis go to work in a more thorough and lawyer-like manner, and though much more ardent in their hatred of Christianity than the Shias, they prove that in *no* case is rebellion obligatory against the Queen. The Doctors of Northern India, on the supposition that India is "Dar-ul-Harb" (a country of the enemy), the Doctors of Calcutta, on the supposition that it is "Dar-ul-Islam" (a country of the Faith), both shew that Holy War is *not* an inevitable duty—in fact, no duty at all. It matters little, it seems to me, which argument is merely plausible, and which really true; the sober-minded will stand by the result, in any case, as the only means of preserving peace. If we have any "Fatwas" to fear, they are those of the

[1] See Shiah pamphlet, already referred to.

Mecca Muftis, who, finding that some decision must be come to, because of the disturbed state of the Muhammadan world generally, and especially of the Empire of the Turk, with regard to this duty of rebellion, have determined in our case that India is "Dar-ul-Islam," and have left men to draw their own inference; and the plainest inference seems to be war. We may, however, comfort ourselves with the thought that the majority of Indian Musalmàns are much too independent to pay very great attention to decisions coming from so great a distance as Mecca, and from men differing from themselves in many other minor points of doctrine and observance[1].

We turn now to consider the present social status of our Indian Musalmàns,—their wants, their wrongs, their grievances, and their future; and that we may obtain a clear idea of the grounds for the popular feeling towards us, I shall first rapidly sketch the nature of the rise and continuance of our power in the East. It was somewhat in this way. Our merchants open a trade with India; are welcomed, build factories, and amass wealth, which arouses the cupidity of native rulers; they are robbed, or otherwise injured, and apply to their Government for redress; an indemnity is there-

[1] The Mecca sects are the Hanafi, the Shafi, the Maliki, and the Hambli (no Mufti). The Sunis in India, forming about 95 per cent. of the whole Musalmàn community, are nearly all Hanafis (from Abu Hanifa A.D. 699-731) with a few Shafis. These differ chiefly in their attitudes at prayer; the former then holding their hands over the navel, never above the head, and muttering "Amen" in silence, the latter holding their hands over the breast, when bowing above the head, and saying "Amen" aloud.

upon exacted, and a portion of land probably demanded as a guarantee for the future. Then comes some act of treachery or cruelty from the weak natives; perhaps a massacre. Stern punishment is necessarily inflicted by the strong power; troops are sent, native princes deposed, and the perpetual presence of an armed force becomes necessary. This is the nucleus of the future empire. We make treaties with neighbouring potentates; their subjects break them, or perhaps a coalition is formed against us, which for our safety must be crushed; or English parties are formed at native courts, and thus more influence and more territory are acquired. So slowly grows the stronger power, advancing step by step, urged on by justice, or necessity, or both; replacing anarchy by order, weakness by strength, until, by the very benefits which it confers, it has gained for itself a title to the gratitude and forbearance of the unwilling people. The native powers become overshadowed, and seek our protection, or desperately rise against us and are crushed; or native successions are riotously disputed, and we step in bringing peace and quietness by setting one candidate on the throne; he, through inherent weakness, requires constant support, leaves us half the management of his kingdom, and at last, becoming the mere shadow of a ruler, his territory lapses to us. Thus gradually advancing, each step perfectly justifiable, and oftenest absolutely necessary, we find ourselves at length possessed of an empire, won for us by our merchants, amalgamated for us by our merchants, and

then handed over by them to the mother country, as a glorious and everlasting trophy of the power and worth of our trade. So have we gained India; and so, though even the natives themselves can prove against us but few acts of decided injustice or tyranny, have we earned the bitter hatred of the former rulers of Hindustan; and the more effectually so, that the fallen powers are obliged to confess that their ruin was originated and accomplished by their own weakness and lack of upright dealing in the outset.

If we take this well into consideration, we shall not, I think, find it hard to understand that indescribable prejudice; that proneness to expect encroachment, that sullen, haughty resentment, which have for so long so entirely held back all the higher classes of Musalmàns from civil employment in India. I cannot for an instant allow the theory, that it is because the Hindu possesses naturally the finer intellect that he has outstripped his rival, though he may be more practical, more shifty, more experienced in the hard school of want and necessity, than the inert aristocratic Musalmàn; but I maintain that his superior success is to be attributed mainly to the fact, that he enters Government employ with a light heart, determined to make the best of everything, while the other only resorts to it in his extremity, full of bitterness and despair. This, I say, is the principal reason,—though time has done much to deaden the sore heart; but there are others also well worthy to be considered, which we shall now proceed to investigate, viz.:

his faults of education and training, and the existence still of many real and imaginary injustices.

How is it, it may be asked, that the Government schools, which seem to suit the Hindu portion of the community of India so admirably, fail so utterly to supply the wants of Musalmàns? The question is a searching one, and requires careful answering. First and foremost, I answer, because the same difficulty exists in getting Muhammadans, as Christians, to accept the only education possible, as a gift from the State, —a purely secular education. And this is even greater with the former than the latter; for, hitherto, quite two-thirds of the education of our ordinary Musalmàn gentlemen has consisted of theology; he must be learned in the Books of the Law. Why this should be so, is plain enough: the Kuràn and the Law-Books founded thereon do not pretend to restrict themselves to purely religious questions; they furnish the principles of civil and social practice in the most minute particulars; in fact they profess to be the supreme guides on every subject that is in any way connected with the welfare of men, both in public and private life. A knowledge of them is therefore as clearly necessary to them from their point of view, as a knowledge of the Books of Moses was to an educated Jew. In "the good old times," one hundred and seventy years ago, when Musalmàns monopolized the administration of the Imperial taxes, the Police and the Courts of Law,—when it was almost as impossible for one to become poor, as now it

is for one to become rich,—education was provided at the expense of the nobles and petty princes. Many a learned man and tutor did these support, and many an acre of land did they grant and bequeath to educational purposes. Learning was an honourable and remunerative profession. *Mais nous avons changè tout cela;* at the cold touch of the Resumption Laws, the profession withered and died. Though, in the main, just and justifiable, and even, in many cases, really necessary, it may be safely said that no single act has done more towards alienating from us the feeling of the upper and proprietary classes of Musalmàns than the enforcing of these same laws. In the days of the Mughul Empire and later still, when the British power was rapidly rising into the ascendant, the landed gentry had been in the habit of making over land, especially to pious uses, with a truly noble, though very unbusiness-like, scorn of parchment and title-deeds. There have always been cheats and unscrupulous persons in all countries; and often were the benevolent and the State, of which they were the dependents, cheated of lands, which legally ought never to have been touched, or which were appropriated to uses other than those for which they had been intended. It was manifestly our duty, when once really supreme, to set such things right; but one can easily imagine the haughty anger with which our demands for deeds were met by men who had held the property for a generation or two, or had received it as a free gift from those whom they had been wont to

consider as their rightful sovereign lords, and from whom they had never dreamed of requiring a title. Thus, the profession of learning died, its tap-root cut: but, even had it survived, of little use would it have been to candidates for our Indian Civil Service, seeing that Muhammadan law is fast becoming extinct in our administration (in itself a sore and bitter grievance).

Again, with regard to the failure of Government instruction: few, if any, of our higher district schools teach the languages necessary for a Muhammadan to enable him to hold a proper position in life, nay, to enable him properly to perform his religious duties. As in the Roman Catholic Church, Latin was, and is still, held to be the right language for prayer, so Persian or Arabic is considered by Musalmàns as the only available exponent of their religious yearnings. The Scriptures were originally received in Persian, and are believed to lose half their power, if not all, in translation. It is not a large-minded idea, but it exists; and Persian and Arabic are utterly untaught in our schools. Again, the instruction we afford is given in the vernacular of Bengal, an ugly language, and one hateful and despicable to all Muhammadans; but, further, it is given by means of Hindu teachers, who alone have cared to qualify themselves for the task; and we need scarcely point out how little likely a Muhammadan parent would be to trust his children to the guidance and care of the hated idolater. And, lastly, as the schools are necessarily open to all classes, not only is there the dread of con-

tamination of caste (though, purification being possible, this is not so great a stumblingblock as with a Hindu), but fathers and mothers are naturally loth to allow their children to associate with the young worshippers of the direst abominations of Islam.

With the Hindu, on the other hand, the case is quite different. He has few, if any, real grudges against us, and he has much cause for gratitude; we have raised him from a state of persecution and slavery to a footing of equality and just competition with his former contemptuous and overbearing masters. Nor have the changes we have introduced, directly affected his original scheme of education. The entire instruction of the Hindu youth has always been entrusted to the care of the Bráhmans, with whom, and with whose institutions, as being more strictly religious, we have, on the whole, interfered but little. The original source is still open to them, though they have generally been wise enough to perceive that our method is productive of much immediate advantage. Moreover, the Hindu fears far less contamination from contact with other religions, provided his own be not violently assaulted. His pantheon is so well stocked; so many new Gods and novel deities have arisen within his own experience, or within that of his father, or grandfather, that he is not primarily inclined to deny the divinity of any strange God, however staunchly he may believe in his own Olympus; nay, he will, sometimes, be careful to confess that there may be other Gods of which he knows not. He does not seek

to proselytize; all he desires is to be let alone; all religions are *possible* to him. The ruin which British rule, directly and indirectly, brought on the rich and privileged native classes, scarcely touched him; nay, rather gave him greater scope for success; and, while the Musalmàn was still brooding over his misfortunes and injuries, he had already determined to go in and win. I cannot pretend here to consider all the *pros* and *cons* of our Indian system; I can do little more than point out those defects which appear to me to be most prominent. Still less can I pretend to discuss any comprehensive remedies; yet, before leaving the subject of education, I cannot refrain from making one or two suggestions. Why should Persian not be taught in our higher district schools? The extra expense would be trifling, as there are hundreds of men in India who would only be too glad to teach it at salaries which would mean starvation to us; and though this were not so, surely a Government which absorbs so much of the native revenues on its own Church and other institutions, could afford to be generous; especially when this generosity would be likely to redound in such benefits to itself! Persian, too, is surely a language worth cultivating for the sake of its literature, of which Bengalese is utterly destitute? Again, as Mr Hunter suggests, why should it not be made a rule, that at least one teacher at each district school should be a Muhammadan? It would be but fair, for we ourselves should refuse to send our children to be instructed by men who were infidels

and idolaters. It is wrong, nay, it is absurd to answer that these matters will right themselves in a generation or two, when our Western civilization shall have opened the minds of the natives, and given them a greater freedom of ideas; as well leave the docks and dandelions unplucked up in a garden, because a year or two hence, our improved method of culture is likely to render it more highly productive. Besides our civilization is not likely to teach freedom from prejudice; and there is always the danger that, while, with harmless, if only partial remedies at hand, we sit waiting for the river to flow past, another mutiny, and a more successful one, may have arisen, backed by Russia; and England, mulcted of her Eastern Empire, may have sunk to the rank of a second or third rate power in the world. God forbid that ever this should be! But the thing is possible: and a drop of water may quench a spark whose flames might have burnt a town. Let us be warned in time.

But to pass to Muhammadan wrongs and grievances. They accuse us of having brought misery and trouble into the whole social life of Islam, public and private, by the abolition of their Kazis, or law-officers, who, corresponding in almost every respect to the Jewish scribes, have been the depositaries and administrators of the Domestic Law from the very earliest times, and who, above all things, alone could give the sanction of religion to the marriage tie. It is now seven years since we appointed the last Kazi; and the evil has been in-

creasing year by year as they have disappeared, till it has reached its present rather appalling dimensions. They seem to have been abolished, on the wider introduction of English Law, from a misunderstanding of their real significance and value to the people; and, as in the case of our ignorance of the Hindu Law of Adoption, such carelessness has worked us untold harm. Again, Mr Hunter tells us, "they charge us with the deliberate malversation of their religious foundations, and with misappropriation on the largest scale of their educational funds." The principal charge, and that around which all the others cluster, concerns the use to which we have put the funds of one of their largest educational bequests. It appears that in 1806 a wealthy Muhammadan gentleman, of the Hugli district, died, leaving a vast estate to pious uses. In consequence of a dispute between the trustees, Government stepped in in 1816, and, making itself one trustee, appointed another. Government then thought fit to apply the funds to the support of a college for poor scholars, which has always been considered a "pious use" in Musalmàn countries; but the college was not made a Muhammadan one, and its foundation would on that account undoubtedly have been held a gross act of impiety by the testator. We can easily imagine with what feelings the Musalmàn community learnt that the trust was to be applied to the endowment of an English college, naturally subversive in its very principles to Islam. "At this moment," writes Mr Hunter, "the head of the college is an

English gentleman, ignorant of a single word of Persian or Arabic, and who draws £1500 a year from a strictly Muhammadan endowment, for teaching things hateful to every Musalmàn!" And, to make matters worse, an attempt has been make to cloak this piece of injustice, by attaching a small Muhammadan school to the college; while, in proof of the little service it has been to them, I find that, some few years ago, out of three hundred who attended, only *three* were Muhammadans. No wonder that it has been said (by an experienced Indian civilian)—"It is difficult to over-estimate the odium, not to say the contempt, which the British Government has incurred by its action in this case."

On turning to consider their grievances, we find in the first place that all the professions are virtually closed to Muhammadans. Until their fidelity can be more fully proved, we have not dared to grant them commissions in the army, their *beau ideal* of a profession: in the Law their old training is now useless, as all Musalmàn polity has been done away with (inevitable and good this, yet, as I have said, in itself a grievous cause of woe and trouble); so that, from having almost monopolised the post of pleaders of the High Court, even as late as 1851, we find that out of two hundred and forty natives admitted between 1852 and 1868, there was only *one* Musalmàn. Every corner of the Law, too, tells the same tale. Turning to Medicine, again we find the Hindu occupying the ground almost exclusively. The Tahib (physician), or Hakim, as we call him, confounds

our system with that of the surgeon-barber, or Jarrah, and refuses to have anything to do with it; and the Jarrah belongs to too low a class to have any chance against the Hindu. Try whatever branch of civil or public life we will, the same fact is always to be found, that the Musalmàn is rapidly disappearing from public employ. Mr Hunter goes into an intricate and most interesting examination of statistics on this subject, and ends by giving us three results which are very significant: amongst Government officials of all sorts, Hindus are more than *seven* times as numerous as Muhammadans, Europeans more than *fourteen* times; and, hence, that Muhammadans form about *one twenty-third* part of the whole administrative body. In fact, it requires no great acuteness to see that, if things go on much longer as they are at present, without doubt this proud and once dominant race must inevitably sink to the level of hewers of wood and drawers of water; and that before very long. The last grievance I shall mention, though not solely a Muhammadan one, is already widely spread, and one which must continue to grow with the growth of education: it is that the English and Presbyterian are the only churches in India which receive support from the State. That is, that, though in such an enormous majority (at least a hundred to one), both Musalmàns and Hindus are compelled to contribute to the maintenance of a religion which both hate with an exceeding bitter hatred; and this in the face of a distinct profession of religious neutrality on the part of the

Government. Lord Ellenborough saw the wrong, and tried to right it in some measure, by presenting the Hindu temple at Umritsur with £500; but the storm which he raised at home and abroad has prevented any repetition of such an attempt. While the missionaries were eager and clamorous in stigmatizing his conduct as an insult to Christianity and to England, did they forget that we annually appropriate hundreds of thousands from the same source for our own religious purposes? It is worse than useless to prove the danger to which an Asiatic mind is liable in the separation of Church and State, the injustice is too evident to be thus glossed over, while every argument lately applied to Ireland applies with an hundred-fold more force to India. I cannot refrain from quoting here the words of an Indian authority, who has always been listened to with well-deserved respect; I mean Mr E. C. Bayley, C.S.I. of the Home Department. He says—"The educated Musalmàn, confident in his old training, sees himself practically excluded from the share of power and of the emoluments of Government, which, hitherto, he had almost monopolized; and sees these and all the other advantages of life passed into the hand of the hated Hindu. Discontent—a feeling, if not of actual religious persecution, yet of neglect on account (indirectly) of his religious views—has filled the minds of the better educated." When we add to this the very visible decay of the nobles in their own country, and in the midst of their own people, we have before us a very fair view of

the position and feelings of the Muhammadan population of India.

What is to be done in this state of affairs? The first thing at any rate will be to see that the money contributed by Muhammadans for educational purposes is expended on an educational system suited to their requirements[1]. It is vain to point to the Madrissah (that Ireland of educational matters) which, founded by Warren Hastings, the State has supported at Calcutta for full 90 years; all the justice in the world cannot make one piece of injustice right. We must restore to the Musalmàn community the charitable funds which have been misappropriated by our Indian Government; we must reappoint the Kazis who are so indispensable to Muhammadan domestic and religious observances; we must see that Christianity is not forced upon the natives, even in appearance, as the religion of the conquering nation.

O that our missionaries would just for a little while lay aside theology, and preach only Christ and his Gospel! would remember S. Augustine's words, "in every religion on earth there is some truth," and strive only to shew that ours holds the most! would read and learn those grand edicts of Asoka graven on the rocks and mountains of India[2] (as imperishable as they), and

[1] Mr Hunter ("Our Indian Musalmàns," pp. 205—7) shews how cheaply and easily provision might be made for the education of Muhammadans.

[2] The edicts of Asoka, the Indian Constantine, who began to reign about 324 B.C., are still to be seen as they were first cut into the rocks of Girnar, Dhanli and Kapurdigiri over two thousand years ago. This is

cease from loud intolerant statements, and appeals made with the terrors of Hell in one hand, and a mean bartering for individual salvation in the other; and holding up the Book of God cry, "Here, my brothers! here is all that God has been teaching you in the past, and all those further truths which alone will fulfil the longings and ideals which your own religion has caused to spring up in your hearts, and which alone can complete all that is necessary for your true life, as men and as a nation." Shall we ever hear this?

But, again, if we provide the peoples of India with a liberal and advanced education, we must take measures that the desires may be satisfied which that education naturally brings with it, or their last state will be worse than their first—in that they will be more conscious than ever of their thraldom. At present they have no share, nay, not the smallest voice, in the administration, and are debarred from rising to honourable posts in the military and civil services of the State; and if this continue it will not be long before even the at present well-contented Hindu will find his position intolerable. Yet who will dare to say that the time is now come when we may implicitly trust the good will and fidelity of our native subjects—even so far as to

one: "A man ought to honour his own faith only; but he should never abuse the faith of others. It is thus that he will do no harm to any body. There are even circumstances where the religion of others ought to be honoured. And in acting thus a man fortifies his own faith, and assists the faith of others. He who acts otherwise diminishes his own faith, and hurts the faith of others."

give them commissions in the Queen's army, with such a picture before us as the State Trials have so recently revealed? It is a hard, a terribly hard question to decide. We have been too wont to think of India as of a small country, and to realize too little that it is a mighty Empire, in which Musalmàns alone number as many as the entire population of the British Isles, while the Hindus are full five times as numerous. It has also long been the bitter curse of India to be the El Dorado of all Europe, and especially of England, the place where speedy and splendid fortunes were to be made; and the men we have sent out thither having this one object in view—to return home as soon as possible with their spoil—have thought too little of justice, and been too little careful of exciting the prejudice of the natives against us; and, even when their aims have been good, have hurried over their work and left it half finished. This time is now well-nigh past, and Europeans are beginning to make India their home. The civilization, whose spirit is fixity, is gradually giving way before that, whose spirit is progress. The Sun, which rose in the East, and from thence lighted up the darkness of our Western world, is now in turn throwing back its strong rays from the Western sky—the East is learning from the West.

We have hard questions to decide. Only let us open our eyes to the fact that we have before us a vast sea of trouble and turmoil, through which it will take all our statesmanship, all our foresight, all our prudence to

guide the vessel of the State. If we will but see the danger in time, we need fear but little for the future. But, if we imagine we can educate the people of India, and still keep them in their present state of servitude, the day will surely come, which will tax England's resources to the uttermost to hold her own against an injured nation; when India will become too costly a possession to be kept. We have undoubtedly conferred great and lasting benefits on the Indians; we have given them continued peace, free trade, the right to live as they like, subject to the laws. Let us do this more; let us initiate timely reforms, and resolve to rule without worrying the people with taxes they are alike unable and unwilling to bear; to admit the higher classes to a fair share in the honourable posts of the public service; and, lastly, to institute a set of Councils, framed on the plan of those in our larger colonies, which may eventually develope into a real representation of the people. If we do these things, if we dare to be just, scorning the imputation of fear, there is no reason why our Indian Musalmàns should not remain our most faithful subjects, and India really be, what we have so often proudly called her, "the brightest gem in our Imperial Crown."

51004

ADDENDUM.

IN the above I have made no mention of the Kookas, and the expedition against them; firstly, because my Essay was sketched and nearly finished before we had heard much about them; and secondly, because our information being even still somewhat confused, I feared to express a premature and hasty opinion. Yet this, at least, I can say, that I perceive in the whole matter strong signs of our very worst faults in the management of the people. A tendency to regard them as mere savages, and therefore to consider ourselves justified in acting towards them in a manner which should stamp us as their inferiors, and in which we should not dare to act towards a European people, however rebellious. It is a mere vicious plausibility to urge that we must be cruel (use what are called "strong measures"), because we rule India in such an extraordinary minority. This, at least, is not the people's fault, and its consequences should not be visited on them. No doubt, under strain and stress of great personal fear, men will, at times, act in a manner

they would themselves consider wrong in cooler moments; yet, though allowances are to be made, personally, for such conduct, the State, being impersonal, should always shew a marked disapproval of it. Cruelty is generally the offspring of fear, and to shew fear is manifestly our worst possible policy; for our power in India does not depend on the terror we inspire (as some with scarcely intelligible vanity seem to imagine it to do), terrible would it be for us if it did!—but upon the great and evident benefits a firm and just rule always confers. None know better than the native gentry of India what a chaos and confusion there would be, were we to be driven out by a rebellion, and therefore *primarily* are they faithful; let us hope for something better in the future. No nation has ever made greater professions of justice and generosity, nor has any ever been in a better position to put such professions into practice than we are now. Let us be really bold, and at length dare to do what becomes us, and to trust a little, if only a little, to God.

Since writing this I see that our Indian Government has adopted, and the general public acknowledged as right, the only just course possible with regard to our presuming and not over-humane officials. In assuming the responsibility of destroying nearly fifty prisoners, Mr Cowan did what could only be justified by the most manifest and extreme danger, whereas in fact there was the most perfect security. For deeds above and beyond

the law to be justifiable, the law must be clearly insufficient to meet the occasion, while Mr Cowan had the fullest assurance that this was not the case. In short, the assumption of the highest prerogatives of the State can only be sanctioned when the State is too weak or too far off to act for itself; whereas the occasion which provoked Mr Cowan's violence had vanished in smoke before he appeared on the scene, and he was in immediate communication with the highest authority to whom he himself had announced that the exercise of military force was needless. All this we know, and yet I believe a few still cry "Injustice! injustice!"

NOTE.—In pleading the cause of the Indian Musalmàns, I have dwelt much on their wrongs and grievances as non-Christians, and more particularly as followers of the religion of Islam; and I have said little or nothing of the real and great advantages which they, in common with the other peoples of India, enjoy (enormous compared with the distant past) in their civil and social life from forming a part of the British Empire; and in this, though from the nature of the case it was inevitable, I fear I may seem to some few to cavil at the lesser mistakes, and to ignore the really great and noble efforts and successes in right government made by our countrymen in India—a land well-nigh as large as all Europe less Russia, and teeming with an extraordinarily mixed population well-nigh as numerous as that of the same portion. In no way whatsoever has this been my intention, for at no time have I considered I had a greater right to be proud I was an Englishman than while reading the history of our doings there as a complete whole; and it is, moreover, my firm conviction, that, if we are only given a few more years to work before the struggle comes with Russia, if come it must, we need have no fear but that the majority of our Indian subjects will stand by those who have given them more real freedom, more prosperity, and more enlightenment than any nation that has ever yet ruled over that marvellous and glorious land.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018